

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/700,908
Response dated June 29, 2004
Reply to OA of **March 30, 2004**

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 and 14-25 are pending in this application. Claims 1-10 and 18-24 are withdrawn from consideration. Amendments to claims 14, 16 and 25 are proposed herein. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter is added in the proposed amendments. It is believed that this Amendment is fully responsive to the Office Action dated March 30, 2004.

Claims 25 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. (Office action paragraph no. 8).

The rejection is overcome by the proposed amendments to claims 25 and 16.

With regard to claim 25, the Examiner indicates that “the bending strength and modulus of bending elasticity and the Izod impact strength” parameters are recited without reference to which component these parameters are measured for. The Examiner refers to the recitation of “increased over conventional glass fiber reinforced ABS”. The Examiner also indicates that ABS should be spelled out as “acrylonitrile-butadiene-styrene”. In the proposed amendment to claim 25, the referred-to clause is deleted.

With regard to claim 16, the Examiner states that there is insufficient basis for the recitation of “said resin selected from acrylonitrile-butadiene-styrene resin and acrylonitrile-styrene resin.” In response, the proposed amendment to claim 25 amends the claim to recite that the “outer reinforcing shell layer” is “made from a material selected from acrylonitrile-butadiene-styrene resin and

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. **09/700,908**
Response dated June 29, 2004
Reply to OA of **March 30, 2004**

acrylonitrile-styrene resin”, and that the outer reinforcing shell layer contains the long glass fibers. Applicants note support for this recitation on page 15, lines 6-18, of the specification. In particular, page 15, line 10, states: “As the foregoing resin composition, ABS resin or AS resin ... is preferred”.

Moreover, the proposed amendment to claim 16 clarifies that it is **the outer shell reinforcing layer** that is reinforced with glass fiber, and the word “additionally” clarifies that the fibers recited in claim 16 are additional to the fibers recited in claim 25.

Claims 25, 11, 12 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Nakagawa. (Office action paragraph no. 9)

Applicants here infer that the cited reference is Nakagawa JP08-090688, cited in the IDS of November 21, 2000, and also in the PTO-892 in the Office action of August 1, 2002, and not Nakagawa, U.S. Patent No. 4,179,760, also cited in that Office action.

The rejection is overcome by the proposed amendments to the claims. Claim 25 has been amended to add the recitation: “wherein the outer reinforcing shell layer is formed by injection molding at an injection pressure of 200 to 1000 kg/cm²”.

The Examiner cites Nakagawa in paragraphs [0028], [0030] and [0031] as disclosing the “twice thermoformed and spread surface layer”. Nakagawa’s figures appear to illustrate vacuum forming of acrylic sheet 1 to form inner surface material 3, followed by placing this inner surface material in a separate mold and injecting thermoplastic resin 6 to surround the inner surface material 3. Nakagawa’s resin 6 would therefore appear to correspond structurally to resin 7 in Figure 6 of the

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. **09/700,908**
Response dated June 29, 2004
Reply to OA of **March 30, 2004**

present application.

Nakagawa's paragraph [0029] indicates that "the coat reinforcement layer" "consists of a thermoplastics **foam** form" (emphasis added), apparently referring to thermoplastic 6 in Nakagawa's drawing. Paragraph [0034] indicates that this may be ABS, and may be "ABS-plastics foam".

However, a foam resin is precluded by the injection conditions in the present invention. Applicants therefore here have reinstated the limitation of injection pressure of 200 to 1000 kg/cm², which had been previously added to claim 25 in the Amendment of July 28, 2003. This injection pressure is not taught in Nakagawa, and Applicants submit that the recited process limitation is inconsistent with Nakagawa's "thermoplastics foam" disclosure.

Applicants also note that the specification of the application indicates that the difference in the ABS of the invention from the "conventional" ABS is a result of the process of the present invention (page 20, lines 15-19).

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakagawa in view of Adams et al., and further in view of Akamatsu. (Office action paragraph no. 10)

Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested in view of the proposed amendments to the claims. The amendment to claim 14 clarifies that it is the "outer reinforcing shell layer" that is made of translucent acrylonitrile-butadiene-styrene resin or translucent acrylonitrile-styrene resin. In addition, base claim 25, as discussed above, has been amended to recite: "wherein the outer reinforcing shell layer is formed by injection molding at an injection

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/700,908
Response dated June 29, 2004
Reply to OA of **March 30, 2004**

pressure of 200 to 1000 kg/cm².

Applicants have argued in regard to paragraph no. 9 of the Office action that the injection pressure limitation is not taught by Nakagawa and is inconsistent with Nakagawa's "thermoplastics foam." Applicants submit that this limitation is not suggested by Nakagawa, Adams et al. or Akamatsu.

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakagawa in view of Stier et al. (Office action paragraph no. 11)

Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

First of all, Applicants have proposed amending base claim 25 to recite: "wherein the outer reinforcing shell layer is formed by injection molding at an injection pressure of 200 to 1000 kg/cm²", and Applicants have argued in regard to paragraph no. 9 of the Office action that the injection pressure limitation is not taught by Nakagawa and is inconsistent with Nakagawa's "thermoplastics foam."

Secondly, the Examiner cites Stier et al. for the recitation of a skid-preventing texture. Stier discloses a "slip-resistant surface coating which comprises a sheet member having a film on its surface, said film embedded therein in plurality of finely divided **abrasive** particles".

However, no abrasive particles are present in the skid-preventing texture of the present application, which is discussed on page 7, lines 13-18, of the specification. Stier's slip-resistant surface could not be produced by the process limitation of claim 15, and Stier does not suggest

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/700,908
Response dated June 29, 2004
Reply to OA of **March 30, 2004**

producing a skid-preventing texture by the method of claim 15.

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakagawa in view of Seymour et al. (Office action paragraph no. 12)

The rejection is overcome by the amendments to the claims. As discussed above, Applicants have amended base claim 25 to recite: “wherein the outer reinforcing shell layer is formed by injection molding at an injection pressure of 200 to 1000 kg/cm²”, and Applicants have argued in regard to paragraph no. 9 of the Office action that the injection pressure limitation is not taught by Nakagawa and is inconsistent with Nakagawa’s “thermoplastics foam.” Applicants submit that neither Nakagawa nor Seymour et al. suggests this limitation.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, claims, as amended, are in condition for allowance, which action, at an early date, is requested.

If, for any reason, it is felt that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants’ undersigned agent at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. **09/700,908**
Response dated June 29, 2004
Reply to OA of **March 30, 2004**

fees which may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS,
HANSON & BROOKS, LLP


Daniel A. Geselowitz, Ph.D.

Agent for Applicants
Reg. No. 42,573

DAG/xl
Atty. Docket No. **001539**
Suite 1000
1725 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 659-2930



23850

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Q:\FLOATERS\DAG\00\001539\Response re FOA of 3-30-04